

**Kentucky Teacher Steering Committee Meeting**  
**October 29, 2012**

**Opening Remarks and Updates from KDE and Overview of Agenda and Meeting Outcomes**

- Felicia called meeting to order and gave greetings
- Jenna went over the agenda for the day
- The group agreed to a working lunch for the day

**First Update**

- FCS went over a few items from the previous meeting including a reminder that KY is moving slowly to go fast. Need to get this right.
- The exit slip comments from the previous meeting indicated members wanted to continue to discuss "the elephant in the room"... Student Growth and how it will be used in the system
- FCS reminder the members that student growth will not be used in isolation that it is one of several measures in the system
- As a means of moving in a strategic way, KY has committed to
  - ✓ spending the last couple of meetings having states present their models,
  - ✓ Have teams of individuals attend national meetings,
  - ✓ Committed to a field test and statewide pilot, and
  - ✓ To learn from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundations.
- Taking this approach will ensure the committee members get to a place to make informed recommendations that will be submitted to the KBE.
- Expecting several recommendations will come forward during the February Steering Committee meeting prior to the April KBE board meeting.
- Lessons learned from other states will be conducted in the January meeting and beginning to formulate recommendations. Robin will send the document she compiled of what other states are doing.

**Second Update**

- A waiver question has come back to the department. Felicia shared in the last TESC the overview of the submission of the responses where the USDOE asked for clarification on several items in Principal 3
- One of the questions asked given the most recent submission focused on the timing for the decision for how KY would be making summative ratings in the new PGES
- FCS shared, KDE's response indicated the TESC will be discussing this in upcoming meetings during the 2012-13 SY and that no decision would be made on how the summative ratings will be determined until next year 2013-14 as a part of the learning from the field test and pilot implementation.
- Bart L, KDE SDFellow and Education Council will come and present on options for summative ratings.
- Beginning in the new year- January, 2013, there will be winter and spring trainings in order to prepare for the statewide pilot.

We will be piloting one summative rating option during our statewide pilot, no accountability, just research. The TESC will make recommendations to the state board to

include that option for summative rating for our effectiveness system during the 14-15 school years.

Q: Will there be a contingency plan if the statewide pilot option does not work?

R: I think we will feel secure in the decision by this point in time. We have several examples from other states. Currently, we are learning there are three options states are exploring.

Brent McKim statement: There are two parts to the Student Growth component. There's what metric that you want to use and how we will use. These are yet to be determined.

KDE acknowledged this point and agreed this will be a part of upcoming discussions. Presenters are asked to share from the other states.

### **KY Team in Washington, D.C.**

- KDE was able to take a team to a Reform Support Network meeting in Washington for RTTT teams to focus on educator effectiveness and how you include leaders in a system.
- Some states have a more specialized rubric for district and local leaders. KDE is investigating this.
- Education Council meeting of about 15 states was there on day three. It was a much focused discussion about educator effectiveness. The teacher and leader effectiveness system will touch on a more comprehensive look at teacher effectiveness.
- The intent is to use this system to drive systems change. Data will inform decision making at the superintendent level. This is directly linked to Title II and how you consider all these components and how you equitably distribute in addition to compensation.
- It has huge implications for everything around this bucket (*see handout shared from the Education Counsel meeting*) The Prichard Committee is setting the stage for this larger conversations in their convenings that are occurring.

### **METS Study**

*See handouts and link to be sent with longer version*

KDE shared two new resources from the MET research group. Both resources highlighted the importance of Student Voice as a measure of effectiveness.

KDE reminded the committee members that KY is field testing the same student perception survey that was used in the MET study - the Tripod survey.

- Wanted to bring to your attention the 7Cs. Bart L will be sharing with you how he is moving forward and streamlining this survey. Many states are opting to streamline the survey and/or add state specific questions to the survey.
- Guidance is coming from Steve Cantrell

Question/Statement: Jefferson County representatives indicated they did not receive feedback from their administration of the survey.

FCS indicated: *Todd Baldwin and Cathy White will follow-up on this question/concern.*

### **Integration Discussion Panel (Washington and Gallatin)**

#### **Gallatin – Superintendent Dot Perkins:**

- Deb Brown – passed the teacher proficiency ... Upper Elem principal
- Carmen Gullion, 3<sup>rd</sup> grade teacher
- Brandon Brockman, PE & Health teacher
- Curt Bieger Middle School principal

The superintendent introduced the panel of teachers and administrators who have all been a part of the field test since the beginning.

Next, **Washington Co. - Cherry Boyles, district instructional supervisor was introduced.** Ms. Boyles indicated that they are a state integration grant site. she represented the teachers and leaders from Washington Co. As the classroom teachers were unable to attend due to scheduling and prior commitments within the district.

The panel comments included:

- Gallatin Comment: Deb Brown Building principal felt like it was hanging over her head. The training was very intense. You must commit to do the assessment.
- Comment: Probably learned more about the teachers and how to observe. It has more clarity.
- 3<sup>rd</sup> grade teacher Carmen Gullion – it does require a lot more time and a lot of thinking ahead of time. Time that I met with my peer observer. Did appreciate that. Gave her an instrument that was filled out based on the lesson that I was going to teach.
- She looked for some management techniques and gave me feedback before I was observed by the principal.
- Observed by new principal
- 23<sup>rd</sup> year of teaching. It was very in-depth and feels that it was very beneficial.
- Comment – more in-depth such as are you creating a positive environment. Really like how this is working.
- We are working on student growth goals. We intentionally included all teachers. The goal setting is much easier in some classes than others.
- Used MAP data, collected that and began to see how this could help set the goals.
- High school history was very difficult to set goals. Teacher went out and created a screener, but was not satisfied with that. So, more work is being done at the local level.

Comments from Monica Osborne, effectiveness coach working with Washington Co.:

- AP Literature teacher collected her data and felt very comfortable with it in collecting the data. When you set growth goals, which set of data to use. A

screeners did allow them to be more intentional around the standard. Some have looked at can we have a common growth goal for the course.

- Four teachers in the districts began with a screener – LDC. Scored the data and analyzed the data to see where the students were scoring.
- Based on the wording of the rubric, she wrote the goal. Teachers are not having a problem writing the goal, but in what type of assessment I will use.
- Teachers want to know what happens if they do not meet the SMART goals for student growth.

### **Gallatin Co.:**

Mr. Brockman indicated a SMART goal was set for students to complete the physical fitness test. Students had to come up with their own improvement plans and complete the plan in 9 weeks.

Following the panel discussion, the steering committee members had a question and answer period with Gallatin and Washington Counties **2:39**

### **State Presentation - Illinois: Vickie Phillips**

Vickie Phillips

Division Administrator

Preparation and Evaluation

Illinois State Board of Education

[vphillip@isbe.net](mailto:vphillip@isbe.net)

Performance Evaluation Reform Act (PERA0 Overview and Details)

See the power point presentation for specific details. The presentation highlights include the following:

Put in place in 2010, Performance Evaluation Advisory Council (PEAC) and PERA are common works that will be used.

- Need to connect what is happening in teacher prep.
- Teaching standards
- Socio-economic
- Academic Proficient
- Literacy
- Common Core
- Teacher Performance Evaluation
- Accountability
- Program review

Legislative mandated changes – bill required that seniority is not the order for layoff. This makes it according to the performance evaluation.

- This is game changer in IL

- 2010 PERA law addresses practice and student growth. Student growth must have multiple measures. Communicating these changes to the public has been one of the biggest battles.
- Could use the general rule to create their system or use the state model.
- Illinois Legislation required
  - All evaluations must be trained and must pass the imbedded assessments in order to perform observations and/or full evaluations.
  - No longer required to have a type 75 certification to be an evaluation, but must have completed/passed evaluation training
  - It can be a teacher or a peer and there are options.
  - Chose Growth Through Learning – based on the minimum state requirements.
  - Training has been very intense and required in a quick fashion. Number of unhappy people. It has facilitated common language and dialogue around teacher practice and student growth. Encourages collaboration, learning and alignment amongst stakeholders.

Implementation date:

- 2012-2013 – all principals and assistant principals evaluated following new rules.
- 2012-2013 – all teacher summative evaluation ratings will reflect one of the four categories: Excellent, Proficient, Needs Improvement or Unsatisfactory
- 2012-2013 – Teacher evaluations following new rules phased in starting with 300 Chicago schools.
- Illinois department of Ed had to work through the Chicago strike

Joint Committee concept – Equal representation of every district. When the joint committee is making decisions, they must come to an agreement. For example, who in the district will do observations? What assessment will they use for student growth?

In the past, each district was to send an evaluation tool to the state board and they had to approve it. Now this is handled by the state board. A majority of the compliance is on the shoulders of the joint committee.

<http://www.lsbe.net/rules/archive/pdfs/50ARK.pdf>

- If 180 days, the joint committee has not agreed to the student growth plan, then they must comply with the state model.

How do you define a teacher?

Definition of a Teacher - PERA rules. A teacher is pretty much anybody except an administrator. Even though we count them as a teacher, they do not have to implement student growth at this time. Service personnel do not have to implement at this time.

Definition of an assistant principal – employee reporting to principal who assists with principal in administration of the school.

Districts do not have to align with C. Danielson, but have to align to the teaching standards. Must use four performance levels.

Timing – at least once every two years of a teacher in contractual continue service (tenured).....

(See copy of PowerPoint)

PEAC website: [www.isbe.net/PEAC](http://www.isbe.net/PEAC)

Discussion topic is how to recalibrate evaluators?

1. For teachers are there other non-academic measures?
  - a. No, but a joint committee can add those in.
2. Every teacher must have a type III assessment (*see power point*)
3. Who are you identifying as a peer
  - a. Up to joint committee
4. Where specifically is there local control
  - a. Joint committee
5. What do you do to promote growth?
  - a. The PD plan is used
6. Your model appears to
7. Is there any type of validity and reliability used for professional practice and student growth
  - a. Instituting a research study. We hope to have a report out at the end of 2014.
8. How your systems can be considered reliability when it is local control.
  - a. Up to the local control
9. ??
  - a. They can do either or both
  - b. For teachers who are dinged  
Local committee
10. How much time is given to unsatisfactory
  - a. Must go back and look, but unsatisfactory two years in a row, then the certification can be pulled
11. How do you communicate
  - a. Weekly newsletter, regional meetings, state. Each one of the stakeholders uses the same PowerPoint. Work closely with unions, principal. Still looking for ways to improve.
12. To get a parent on the committee – Equal representation of the district and unions.
13. Can a teacher lose tenure because of effectiveness?
  - a. Yes, if they are unsatisfactory.

Following the presentation the TESC discussed a few key points for consideration from the learning from the IL presentation. Jeanna captured these ideas on post-it chart paper for future reference. Many of the items are captured below.

**Lessons Learned from IL – See white pages written by Jenna.**

- Teachscape (Illinois using) - Implications for KY
- Continue working in a collaborative way
- Proficient - Communication plan to get buy in
- Be clearer about assessment for student growth goal setting ( see KY list from early on in process)
- Illinois system had a very specific scoring criteria for det. who would be laid off (3.62-3.63) scoring with the levels of criteria - clarify
- Illinois sanctioned to use the State Model?
- Illinois observation cycle – two top rankings (the rules) (for non-tenured, etc.)
- Illinois Joint committee (like own 50/50 Committee)
- Component by component – waiver for a small piece
- Improve or tweak your system (to incorporate Danielson)
- Needs to be done by committee
- Waiver to a State Model language is problematic
- Should look at alternative models to state model
- There are existing , alternate models in the state that worked for eight years to achieve buy-in in their local model – waiver – if wanted to create an alternate model would have to do a validity or reliability study to support our model? (yes)
- Must consider entire system
- Can we release in phases (status crucial)?
- Need Statewide Pilot Plan discussion
- Flexibility in alternative strategies

Next the committee proposed the following dates for meetings in the second semester of the year.

**2013 proposed Calendar dates:**

Jan., Feb. & March:

Jan. 18

Jan. 23

Jan. 14

Jan. 29

Jan. 15

Feb. 15

Feb. 13

Feb. 19

Feb. 22

March 5, 7, 11, 22,

TESC committee member requested KDE send the dates out on a Doodle Scheduler and to do so this week.

## **Recommendations/Presentation from the subcommittees on non-tested grades and subjects and special education and EL educators**

The discussion was introduced by KDE staff Denise Bailey and Rebecca Woosley

70% of the teachers in the state fall into these areas.

1. Support of the system that takes in account and how to measure and how it works.
2. What are the characteristics of this measure?

Rebecca Woosley observed as a facilitator:

- Devoted some serious hard working thinking time to this work.
- Ended up having 238 years of experience in the room for this subgroup.
- Decided to write a guidance document to understand the context .
- Introduction that is similar
- On page 4, we highlighted, page 5 is the second recommendation
- Every single word was vetted. Everybody came to consensus on what is in the document. Will break down into four groups and select a recorder who will record this information. We will have another meeting and take your feedback to the sub-group who will make changes.

### **Group feedback:**

- *Group 1*
- Special Ed – page 4 – “With this wording, if a 5<sup>th</sup> grade student comes in at this level and at the end of the year, they made a 4<sup>th</sup> grade level, the teacher would not have closed the gap even though the student made a full year of growth.
- Page 9 – Worry that aligned to regular education, will not allow enough tiers for all to reach developmentally.
- How do you pro-rate credit or accountability for teachers. Do not think that a teacher should get 1/3 of credit if she is in the class only a few minutes.
- No comments on non-tested areas.

### ***Group 2***

- Separate into two documents – one for Special Ed and one for ELL.
- Build the technology – click on Special Ed, ELL, etc. You could have the PD session tailored to each teacher. Specific to the teacher and what she teaches.
- Page 15 & 11 – if this recommendation applies to only ELL teachers or Special Ed or both. State which it applies to.

Non-tested – page 2. Need to define master teachers

### ***Group 3***

- No comments on the Special Ed. document



- Recommendation is that you make some connection with Dr. Stronge's group and see some examples of goals that have been accepted.

#### *Group 4*

- If you are in a resource setting and every child already has IEP goals, isn't it redundant to have student growth goals.
- Does each teacher create a SGG for each class they teach?
  - a. Response: We did not address that scenario. On the Nov. 8 meeting they can have more discussion on that. We are doing survey work and this might be just a natural part of the work.
  - b. Is there something about an IEP that can influence the growth goal? We don't know the answer. This is new ground.

*Send the link for the Council of Exceptional Children - new research just released.*

Response: Dr. Stronge has a new bank of student growth goals that can be shared. The recommendations in front of the committee today represent a first attempt to get something in front of you to react to.

FCS indicated, the role of the committee is to take this back and refine these recommendations. If you want the committee to pursue a state that with student growth goals for special education, we can do that.

Felicia shared the statewide expectation of the 13 – 14 school years. It will be every district and a number of participants within each district.

We have already heard that many districts will be including more than the suggested number of individuals. We will be sending out in the next few months -- an intent to participate in the statewide model.

#### **The TESC members shared recent work and updates**

Sharing – Brent McKim – Montgomery County Maryland came in and mapped to one another the Danielson and their JCPS proposed system.

Prichard is having another Teacher Team meeting on Friday.

KEA – Met with US DOE. Several were at the KBE meeting and follow up with Dr. Cantrell. Mary Ann Blakenship indicated that when she was at the RSN network went to a break out session got some interesting info and particularly a summative evaluation might be presented. Rep. Rollins says he is interested in the teacher evaluation. KEA has just learned that their Gates grant focused on communication and leaders was awarded. Mary Ann Blakenship indicated that they will coordinate all messages with KDE to ensure accurate and consistent messaging the KY teachers.

FCS asked Donna Brockman to share at the next steering committee meeting about the role of local boards in the development and implementation of a new educator

effectiveness system. she asked Donna to connect with Robin Chandler for follow up discussion to prepare for this sharing.

FCS indicated we will continue a focus on the following at the next TESC meeting:

1. Student learning objectives with a possible presentation from Dr James Stronge,
2. Voices from the field – teachers, and
3. Draft of communication going to all districts.

The meeting adjourned.